

APPLICATION OF RATING CRITERIA

1) Project represents the following type of space:	<u>Points</u>
• <u>Instruction, Library, Research, Infrastructure</u>	<u>30</u>
• <u>Academic Support</u>	<u>20</u>
• <u>Student Services</u>	<u>15</u>
• <u>Institutional Support</u>	<u>10</u>
• <u>Non-Educational & General (E&G)</u>	<u>0</u>

A) Points were assigned based on percentage of proposed use

B) If the project involves several buildings, or a multi-use E&G facility (including instruction), and the percentage of use is by category is unknown, 20 points were assigned.

2) Degree to which proposed project up to 25
 addresses deferred maintenance needs
 as defined and included in the joint CHE
 and B& CB 1994 Study of Deferred
 Maintenance, or other objective
 documentation provided by the institution.

Staff used the 1994 study as a baseline for applying this criterion because it was the only consistent, objective, documentation available for all institutions. The Rating Committee will determine how the additional documentation provided by an institution will apply.

A) Points were assigned based on the scores in the 1994 Study:

<u>1994 Score</u>	<u>Points Assigned</u>
90-100	10
80-89	15
70-79	20
Less than 70	25
Multiple Buildings/Multiple Scores	20
Infrastructure*	25
Project not addressed in 1994	0

*Infrastructure was not separately addressed in 1994.

POINTS

3) Documentation that project corresponds Up to 25
to the institution's mission and enhances
institutional effectiveness and efficiencies
with respect to programs.

All projects submitted were found to correspond to the institution's mission, and to enhance institutional effectiveness and efficiencies with respect to programs.

4) Documentation that all reasonable up to 10
alternatives to the project have been
considered, that the project represents
the best long-term resolution of the
problem, and that the total estimated cost,
including each component, can be
documented as realistic.

A) Institutional/External documentation, 10
and project has score of 80 or less in
the 1994 study.

B) Project is infrastructure or mechanical 10
repair/roof replacement (etc.)

C) Internal/External documentation, and 7
project has score greater than 80,* or was
not addressed in 1994 Study. (Assign
66% of available points, rounded up)

*If a facility was considered to be suitable for renovations of 20% or less of its replacement cost in the 1994 Study, and the current proposal recommends demolition or a significant alteration of the facility, a score of 7 was assigned.

5. New construction to accommodate mission-related up to 25
enrollment growth. Documentation that the anticipated
enrollment growth corresponds to the institution's mission
and justification of the need for additional square footage in
relation to utilization of existing space.

A) Mission-related – (based on app. enroll. proj.) 10

B) Utilization - % of norms for type of space 15

POINTS

6) Documentation that space programmed for the proposed project is based on the application of objective space planning guidelines. up to 10

Institutional/External documentation provided
Infrastructure/Repair/Replacement (mechanical,
roofs, etc.) 10

Not addressed 0

Sub-Total Points **Up to 125**

7) EXTRA POINTS: up to 10

Documentation through external reports (CHE consultants, Institutional Consultants, specialized accrediting reports, CHE staff evaluation, etc.) that existing space is unsatisfactory and/or unsuitable in terms of quality or quantity because of health and/or safety concerns.

A) documented through external reports 10

B) documented by institution without external documentation (66% of available points, rounded up) 7

C) Not Applicable or Not Addressed 0

Total Possible Points **Up to 135**

Examples of Health and Safety Concerns:

Documented
Health Concerns

Exposure to asbestos or;
other harmful substances;
documented problems assoc.
with air quality; etc.

Documented
Safety Concerns

Threat of physical
danger assoc. with
condition of facility;
Life/Safety issues
(egress, fire code compliance), etc.